

also duly noted that a portion of the written description actually tended to teach away from the claimed limitation.

Claim 18 is currently amended to overcome this rejection, and Figure 1 has been amended to provide some additional insight as to how the current prototype functions. In addition, two new figures, Figures 5 and 6, have been provided, and show essentially the same view and features as Figure 1, but with the claimed adjustment made at different angles to elucidate the way by which the grass guide, along with the cutting blades, are adjusted to enable the end user to use less power when cutting grass relative to that which would be expended by cutting grass with a traditional lawnmower.

Figure 1 has been amended by specifying the grass guide angular adjustment set at 45° from vertical, and thus 45° from the horizontal cutting surface, i.e., the ground. In addition, two horizontal lines labeled as Line A and Line B have been drawn in. Line A is abutted by the bottom-most portion of the grass guide, and Line B is abutted by the bottom-most portion of a cutting blade. The relationship between the two is that Line A is higher from the ground than Line B.

Figures 5 and 6 depict essentially the same image as Figure 1, except that the angular adjustments of the grass guide is set at 5° and 90° from vertical, respectively. The claimed range of adjustment has been narrowed in the current amendment from 1-90° from vertical to 5-90° from vertical because based on experiments performed by the inventors with the prototype, the intended utility of the mower was lost when adjustments were made at less than 5° from vertical. Nevertheless, even at the extreme angular adjustments, Line A always remains at a greater altitude than Line B, as depicted in Figures 5 and 6.

Claim 18 has been amended by indicating that the relationship between Line A, which is abutted by the bottom-most portion of the grass guide, and Line B, which is abutted by the bottom-most portion of the cutting blades, remains the same; Line A is always above Line B. This is to say that the bottom-most portion of the grass guide is always higher from the ground than the bottom most portion of the cutting blades, and the vertical distance between the two changes as a result of adjusting the angle of the grass guide from vertical. The curved arrows in Figures 1, 5 and 6 are meant to show that the semicircular extension of the grass guide that is mounted to the chassis can be adjusted to allow an angular range of motion of the grass guide of 5-90° from vertical that always retains the spatial relationship between the bottom of the grass guide and the bottom of the blades. The purpose is to bend the grass into a position where cutting by the blades is most efficient; i.e., requires the least cutting surface area possible at the end of the blades. For the average lawn, the ideal range of angular adjustment will fall somewhere around 20° from vertical based on what has thus far been observed.

Amendment to Drawings – 37 C.F.R. § 1.121

Figure 1 has been amended and a copy of the original along with a Replacement Sheet is enclosed as an attachment to the amended specification and claims. In addition, two New Sheets to be added as Figure 5 and Figure 6 have been included to provide clarification as to how the claimed grass guide adjusts, and how that adjustment affects the operation of the claimed rotary cutting apparatus. All drawings submitted herewith are in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84.

The total number of pages enclosed in this submission, including Forms PTO/SB/30 and PTO/SB/92, is 23.

If you have any questions regarding the above remarks or any part of the amended application submitted herewith, please do not hesitate to contact me at 410-409-4289, or via email at wordlloyd@comcast.net.

Sincerely,



Steven S. Lloyd
Registered Patent Agent No. 56,650

6/18/2007
Date